

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Various claims are amended herein. No new matter is involved. It is believed that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated September 28, 2007.

The Examiner's indication that the drawings filed on September 9, 2003 are accepted is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art ("AP") in view of Gibson et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,835,719 ("Gibson") or Lee. Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments made herein.

Applicants submit that the recitation of currently amended claim 1 of "wherein the gateway card is detachably connected to the information processor" is not described by Gibson. The Office Action at page 3 specifically asserts, "...Gibson teaches a network card located within the subsystem of the personal computer [12 – col. 3 lines 5-12]...."

Gibson further states that the components that make up the remote wake-up section of the Network Controller are placed on a single integrated circuit (IC) chip. Accordingly, as the network controller 12 of Gibson is located within the input/output (I/O) subsystem of the personal computer 10, the alleged gateway card of Gibson cannot be detachably connected to an information processor.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the recitation of currently amended claim 1 of “the access control unit carries out a control to adjust a difference between the communication protocols of said one of the networks and said another one of the networks” is not described by Lee.

Lee relates to an energy-conserving communication apparatus selectively switching between a main processor with main operating instructions and a keep-alive processor with keep-alive operating instructions. The Office Action at page 5 correlates the access control unit and the networks of claim 1 of the present application with communication circuit 450 and the phone modular socket 401 of Lee, respectively.

Lee describes the communication circuit 450 as a modem chip for demodulating and modulating data. Lee further states that a set of operating instructions are employed to actuate communication circuit 450 to receive incoming information when a ring detect circuit 420 detects a ring (or communication) signal. (Lee; column 13, lines 28-41).

Applicants are unable to find a description in the cited art of the access control unit as recited above in currently amended claim 1; specifically, carrying out a control to adjust a difference between the communication protocols of said one of the networks and said another one of the networks as recited in currently amended claim 1 of the present application. Lee only describes checking if the received incoming information contains a virus. (Lee; column 14, lines 12-19).

Further, Applicants submit that the Examiner's contention regarding the "networks" recitation of claim 1 being taught by the phone modular socket 401 of Lee is misplaced. Lee specifically states that the phone modular socket 401 removably accommodates a phone modular jack with a signal transmitting medium of a phone line including a tip line 402T and a ring line 402R. Accordingly, a plurality of networks are not described. Instead, if received information instructs communication circuit 450 to further initiate another communication link to another remote communication system, a dial out through the same phone modular socket 401 would be initiated to another device. (Lee; column 13, line 64 to column 14, line 11). Accordingly, data could not be received and transmitted concurrently between different networks.

Thus, to further clarify the recitation of claim 1 of the "networks," Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, "... an apparatus connected to the one of the networks; ... an external apparatus connected to another one of the networks". Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to teach at least the aforementioned recitation of claim 1 of the present application.

Although the arguments presented above are directed toward claim 1, the above arguments are applicable where appropriate toward various other independent claims of the present application (claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AP in view of Dea. Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite “an access control unit ... carries out a control to adjust a difference between the different communication protocols of said first network and said second network. Claim 20 has been amended in a somewhat similar manner.

Dea relates to a programmable power management system and method for network computer stations and describes a workstation or PC programmed to enter a wake-up mode on specific broadcast packets or, alternatively, may be caused to autonomously respond to a broadcast packet with a simple pre-determined packet. (Dea; column 4, lines 15-19).

The Office Action at page 9 correlates the access control unit of claim 19 with that of the NIC card of system 12 or 28. Dea states that NIC 112 is performing the function of monitoring network activity for information contained in a packet which is of interest to the particular station. (Dea; column 7, lines 31-34). Further, Dea describes the MAC controller (block 162 of FIG. 4) as performing a comparison to determine whether a frame address represented by the destination address in the packet matches the unique address of the station.

Further to the foregoing, Applicants are unable to find a description of the alleged access control unit of Dea carrying out a control to adjust a difference between different communication protocols of the first network and the second network as recited in currently amended claim 19 of the present application. The other cited reference fails to remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Dea.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk et al., US 2004/0019489 (“Funk”) in view of Khouli et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,308,278 (“Khouli”).

Funk relates to a method and system for controlling a home automation system by voice input provided via a telephone unit.

The Office Action concedes that Funk fails to teach or suggest an access control unit as recited in claim 1 of the present application. The Office Action contends that Khouli cures the aforementioned deficiency of Funk. Applicants respectfully submit that the recitations of at least claim 1 are not taught or described by the cited art.

Khouli relates to supplying standby voltage to memory and wake up circuitry to wake a computer from a lower power mode.

The Office Action generally asserts that the access control unit of claim 1 is described at column 8, lines 1-28 of Khouli. The cited portion of Khouli describes a 1394 interface 710 (firewire) that includes a PHY chip 720 and a Link chip 715. (Khouli; column 8, lines 1-4). As Khouli relates to improving power management of a local computer system, different networks are not described. Accordingly, it is not surprising that Khouli fails to teach or suggest at least the recitation of currently amended claim 1 of an access control unit carrying out a control to adjust a difference between communication protocols of one of the networks and another one of the networks. Additionally, Khouli fails to specifically describe a “gateway card” or for that matter, a gateway card detachably connected to an information processor as recited in currently amended claim 1.

Amendment
Application No. 10/657,194
Attorney Docket No. 021669

Although the arguments presented above are directed toward claim 1, the above arguments are applicable where appropriate toward various other independent claims of the present application (claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18).

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Joseph W. Iskra
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 57,485
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/JWI/klf